

Ser. No. 10/733,606

Remarks

Claims 1-15 were pending in the application. Claims 1-6 were rejected. Claims 7-15 were withdrawn. No claims were merely objected to and no claims were allowed. By the foregoing amendment, claim 8 is canceled, claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 12, and 14 are amended, and claims 16-21 are added. No new matter is presented.

Restriction was required as follows:

- I. Claims 1-6, drawn to an apparatus for cleaning a surface, classified in class 134, subclass 166R.
- II. Claims 7-11, drawn to an inspection camera, classified in class 134, subclass 201.
- III. Claims 12-15, drawn to a method for cleaning a surface, classified in class 134, subclass 22.1

Applicants affirm the election of Group I with traverse. Traverse is on the grounds that examination of all the claims would not present an undue burden. Although separately classified, the search classes of the three groups are expected to largely, if not completely, overlap. Discussed further below, each of the sets of claims has been amended to identify the use of an extensible head, a common technical feature unifying the groups. Accordingly, if the restriction requirement is withdrawn, claims 1-15 will be examined. If not withdrawn, claims 1-6 will be examined.

Specification

The specification was objected to. The examiner requested a more descriptive title, reference to FIG. 5 in the specification, and an abstract referencing the apparatus for cleaning a surface as specified in claim 1. By the foregoing amendment, these have been provided.

Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112(2). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as to the amended claims.

The amendment provides appropriate antecedent basis for the identified terms.

Ser. No. 10/733,606

Double Patenting

Claims 1 and 2 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 11 of copending Application No. 10/801,215(20050199743 A1). Claims 1-3, 5, and 6 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 8 of US Patent No. 7011047 in view of JP 59-219620 or US Patent No. 6828524. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

The rejection is believed moot in view of the foregoing amendment. There is no suggestion for the use of an extensible head.


Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. 102 and 103

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected as being anticipated by Aarnio et al. (US7011047). Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunter (US5494004) or Zilka et al. (2002/0112638) in combination with JP'620. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

The cited references alone or in combination fail to suggest the use of an extensible head as is now claimed.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1-7 and 9-21 are in condition for allowance. Please charge any fees or deficiency or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account of record.

Respectfully submitted,


By 
William B. Slate
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No.: 37,238

Telephone: 203-777-6628

Telefax: 203-865-0297

Date: November 30, 2006

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted this 30th day of November, 2006 to the USPTO, at Fax No. 571-273-8300.


Antoinette Sullo